REMARKS

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for insufficient antecedent basis. Claims 1, 4-11, 14-17, 19-24, and 26-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over United States Patent Number 7,069,434 to Ilnicki et al. (hereinafter Ilnicki) in view of United States Patent Publication 2005/0069135 by Brickell (hereinafter Brickell).

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of February 19, 2008. We discussed a proposed amendment. Applicants agreed to submit the amendment for examination, and do so with this response.

Response to rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for insufficient antecedent basis. Applicants have amended claim 8 to change "the secure computing module" to "TPM."

Amendments to the Claims

Claim 1 is amended with the limitation "...wherein the non-conforming computing module cannot transact the secure function with the secure function module using cryptographic keys of the excluding computing module..." The amendment is fully supported by the specification. See page 10, ¶ 39.

Applicants have further amended claim 1 with the limitation "...communicate with the excluding computing module, the excluding computing module configured to exclusively transact the secure function with the secure function module so that the non-conforming computing module must transact the secure function through the excluding computing module, the communication module further configured to communicate with the non-conforming computing module, the non-conforming computing module configured to transact the secure function with the secure function module and unable to transact the secure function through the excluding computing module..." The amendment is fully supported by the specification. See page 2, ¶ 5, 7. Claims 8, 11, 17, 24, and 30 are similarly amended.

Applicants have also amended claim 1 with the limitations "…receive an excluding computing module context that enables the secure function module to transact secure functions with an excluding computing module…" and "…receive a non-conforming computing module context that enables the secure function module to transact secure functions…" and removed redundant language to clarify the language of the claim.

Claim 1 is further amended with the limitation "…identify the excluding computing module initiating the secure function and set the context of the secure function module to the excluding computing module context and to identify the non-conforming computing module initiating the secure function and set the context of the secure function module to the non-conforming computing module context…" The amendment is fully supported by the specification. See page 11, ¶ 43.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 4-11, 14-17, 19-24, and 26-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ilnicki in view of Brickell. Applicants traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 is amended with the limitations "…so that the non-conforming computing module must transact the secure function through the excluding computing module…" and "…wherein the non-conforming computing module cannot transact the secure function with the secure function module using cryptographic keys of the excluding computing module…" See claim 1 as amended. See also claims 8, 11, 17, 24, and 30. Thus the present invention claims that the exclusive computing module is configured so that the non-conforming computing module must transact the secure function with a TPM through the exclusive computing module and the non-conforming computing module cannot transact the secure function with the secure function module of the TPM using cryptographic keys of the excluding computing module.

Claim 1 further includes the limitations "…identify the excluding computing module initiating the secure function and set the context of the secure function module to the excluding computing module context and to identify the non-conforming computing module initiating the secure function and set the context of the secure function module to the non-conforming

-13-

computing module context…," "…receive an excluding computing module context that enables the secure function module to transact secure functions with an excluding computing module…," and "…receive a non-conforming computing module context that enables the secure function module to transact secure functions with a non-conforming computing module…" Claim 1 as amended. Claims 8, 11, 17, 24, and 30 as amended include similar limitations.

In contrast, neither Ilnicki nor Brickell teaches an exclusive computing module configured so that the non-conforming computing module must transact the secure function with a TPM through the exclusive computing module and that the non-conforming computing module cannot transact the secure function with the secure function module of the TPM using cryptographic keys of the excluding computing module. Ilnicki teaches securely transferring data between an application server and an agent using a session key. If the application server in combination with the TPM of Brickell is analogous to the TPM of the present invention, there is no teaching of the application server being limited to exclusively transacting a secure function with the agent. In addition, there is no non-conforming computing module in Ilnicki and Brickell that can also transact the secure function with the application server but that cannot transact the secure function with the application server through the agent.

Applicants therefore submit that claims 1, 8, 11, 17, 24, and 30 are allowable as Ilnicki and Brickell do not teach each element of the claims. Applicants further submit that claims 4-7, 9, 10, 14-16, 19-23, and 26-29 are allowable as depending from allowable claims.

Conclusion

As a result of the presented remarks and amendments, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. In the event any questions remain, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate a telephone conference with the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 10, 2008

Kunzler & Associates
8 E. Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: 801/994-4646

/Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler
Reg. No. 38,527
Attorney for Applicant